

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,615,026 (Wong) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,408,699 (Yamashita et al.). The Examiner rejected Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Yamashita et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,572,223 (Phillips). The Examiner rejected Claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,554,996 (Chatzipetros) in view of Yamashita et al.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that Wong in view of Yamashita et al. renders the elements of the claim unpatentable. Wong discloses a portable telephone with a directional transmission antenna; Yamashita et al. discloses portable radio equipment having a display. It is respectfully submitted that the grounds for the rejection fail on several points. First, Claim 1 recites a portable terminal having an overall length that is less than $\frac{1}{2}$ a wavelength. The Examiner alleges that this element is disclosed in Wong; it is not. The actual size of the telephone described in Wong is never even disclosed. Yamashita et al. does not cure this defect.

Second, Claim 1 recites a conductor connected to a printed circuit board disposed within the terminal body such that an electrical equivalent length of the portable radio terminal is $\frac{1}{2}$ wavelength. The conductor forces the electrical equivalent length of the portable terminal to equal $\frac{1}{2}$ wavelength, even though the actual length is less than $\frac{1}{2}$ wavelength. The Examiner alleges that this element is disclosed in Wong; it is not. Wong discloses the spacing between an antenna and a metallic surface; an electrical equivalent length of the Wong telephone is never discussed. Yamashita et al. does not cure this defect.

Third, Claim 1 recites shifting a peak current distribution point. The Examiner

alleges that this element is disclosed in Wong; it is not. The Examiner cites the “arrowed ‘x’” as showing a shift, when in fact the “arrowed ‘x’” of Wong is merely a point at which the cross section views of FIGs. 2, 3 and 4 are taken from as set forth in the Brief Description of the Drawings section. The “arrowed ‘x’” in no way represents a shift of anything in Wong. Yamashita et al. does not cure this defect.

Fourth, since there is no shift of a peak distribution point disclosed by Wong, reducing the peak current radiated from the peak current distribution point as recited in Claim 1 also can not be disclosed. The Examiner alleges that Yamashita et al. discloses a peak distribution point being shifted; it is not. Yamashita et al. discloses that the antenna gain is reduced by the placement of certain components of the portable radio being located in close proximity of the antenna thereby reducing sensitivity of **the receiver**. Claim 1 clearly deals with radiation from the portable radio, not reception gain.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection to independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejections of independent Claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that Chatzipetros in view of Yamashita et al. renders the elements of the claims unpatentable. Chatzipetros discloses an antenna for a communication device. First, Claims 6 and 10 recite shifting a peak current distribution point. Chatzipetros does not disclose a shifting of the peak distribution point, and especially not a shift in order to specifically reduce the influence of electromagnetic waves upon a user’s head as recited in Claims 6 and 10. Yamashita et al. does not cure this defect.

Second, since there is no shift of a peak distribution point disclosed by Chatzipetros, reducing the peak current radiated from the peak current distribution point as recited in Claims 6 and 10 also can not be disclosed. The Examiner alleges that Yamashita et al. discloses a peak distribution point being shifted; it is not. Yamashita et al. discloses that the antenna gain is reduced by the placement of certain components of

the portable radio being located in close proximity of the antenna thereby reducing sensitivity of **the receiver**. Claims 6 and 10 clearly deal with radiation from the portable radio, not reception gain.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claim 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-9, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516